

Minutes

City of Loma Linda

Department of Community Development

Planning Commission

Chair Neff called a Adjourned Regular Meeting of the Planning Commission to order at 7:03 p.m., **Wednesday, March 31, 2004**, in the City Council Chambers, 25541 Barton Road, Loma Linda, California.

Commissioners Present: Randy Neff, Chair
Mary Lee Rosenbaum, Vice Chair
Shakil Patel

Commissioners Absent: Eric Essex
Michael Christianson

Staff Present: Lori Lamson, Senior Planner
Jeff Peterson, Associate Engineer, Public Works Department
Jocelyne Larabie, Administrative Secretary

ITEMS TO BE DELETED OR ADDED

There were no items to be added or deleted.

ORAL REPORTS/PUBLIC PARTICIPATION ON NON-AGENDA ITEMS

There were no oral reports.

CONTINUED ITEMS

PUBLIC HEARING

PC-04-20 - GENERAL PLAN UPDATE PROJECT - The project is a comprehensive update to the City's General Plan, which was originally adopted in 1973. A Draft General Plan document has been prepared based on public input received in various public workshops over the past two years. The draft document has been designed to respond to and reflect the City's changing conditions and community goals in order to guide the City's development during the next twenty years. The project boundaries include all of the City's corporate limits and the Sphere of Influence in the San Bernardino County unincorporated areas generally located south of Redlands Boulevard, east of California Street, south of Barton Road and west of the San Timoteo Creek Channel, and the southeast portion of the South Hills area into San Timoteo Canyon and south to the Riverside County line. The Draft General Plan document addresses issues and sets broad policies related to Land Use, Community Design, Circulation, Economic Development, Housing, Conservation, Open Space, Noise, Safety, Public Services and Facilities, and Historic Preservation.

Senior Planner Lamson reported that this meeting was the third public hearing meeting for the review of the draft General Plan and that there were no new comments or letters from the public since the last meeting.

Ms. Lamson explained that the following elements were on the agenda for discussion:

- Element 1 – Introduction to the General Plan
- Element 4 – Economic Development
- Element 6 – Transportation and Circulation
- Element 7 – Noise
- Element 9 – Conservation and Open Space

Ms. Lamson informed the Commission that the Special Joint City Council and Planning Commission workshop was scheduled for Monday, April 19, 2004 in the Community Room to discuss the Hillside Mixed Use designation. She added that a special meeting would be necessary to review the draft EIR.

Element 4 - Economic Development

Chair Neff began discussion on section 4.2 – Local Economic Profile with Table 4-A – Major Employers in Loma Linda. He asked why Food Services had been included with Arts, Entertainment, and etc. employers.

Commissioner Rosenbaum interjected that she had a question on Page 4-1, in the last sentence of the third paragraph, which stated: "... While new development may add to a city's service delivery responsibilities, it will also contribute to increased local revenues." She wanted to ensure that it was clear that this would occur only if the opportunity for residents to spend money really existed.

Commissioner Rosenbaum suggested that the sentence read:

... While new development may add to a city's serviced delivery responsibilities, it will also, at the same time, contribute to increased local revenues, **where opportunities exist for people to spend their discretionary income.**

Chair Neff continued his comment regarding Food Services Employers. He added that he felt that the numbers listed in the plan might give the impression that Loma Linda had many restaurants when in reality there are very few and asked if it could be given its own category.

Senior Planner stated that the "Food Services" category could be placed in a category of its own to emphasize the need for more eating establishments.

Commissioner Rosenbaum commented that it was not clear in table 4.B where Loma Linda residents worked; it simply stated that there are 478 people working in Arts, etc. but not all those employers were in the City of Loma Linda. Senior Planner Lamson explained one of the uses for the data was to encourage developers to come to Loma Linda, prospective businesses need to know which types of work the residents were doing. She continued to say that this would bring a job vs. housing balance that would allow the residents to work within the City of Loma Linda.

Chair Neff suggested that a table similar to table 4.B appear under 4.A to define the actual businesses in Loma Linda that would hire Loma Linda residents and that would provide the same type of information in 4.B.

A discussion started regarding the influence of Loma Linda University and Medical Center on the City's economic well-being. Commissioner Rosenbaum commented that the University had in her opinion an "indirect" affect on the City.

Senior Planner Lamson stated that she would consult with LSA Associates to clarify the wording.

A discussion with the audience began regarding an agreement between the City and the University. Commissioner Rosenbaum requested that the details of the relationship between the City and the University be spelled out in the General Plan. Senior Planner Lamson replied that it was inappropriate to have in the plan. Commissioner Rosenbaum asked if some language could be added that would protect the City financially.

Following the discussion with the audience, Senior Planner Lamson stated that she would contact the City's Legal Counsel to obtain an opinion on the situation.

- Section 4.2.2. – Job/Housing Balance in City of Loma Linda

In the first paragraph, Commissioner Rosenbaum pointed out that the table number should be Table 4.D not Table 4.A.

- Section 4.5 – Identified Issues and Opportunities

In the last paragraph of that section, a reference is made to a "downtown area or city center", Chair Neff requested clarification on the location of the "downtown" or the "city center".

Ms. Lamson stated that she would get a clearer definition from LSA Associates.

- Section 4.6.1(e) – Guiding Policy for Business Attraction and Expansion

Commissioner Rosenbaum requested clarification on the definition of “vendors” in the fifth bullet.

Chair Neff requested clarification in the fourth bullet regarding development on Barton Road and California Street.

Ms. Lamson explained that the item focused on the service industries not necessarily the restaurants but with ancillary uses of restaurants on California Street.

Glenn Elssmann, 24949 Prospect Street stated that he had similar concerns regarding the language in the third bullet and in Section 4.6.3 (g) regarding the hotel industry. He commented that the language was too specific and could be construed as a restriction for the development of businesses in areas other than the ones specified in the plan.

Ms. Lamson stated that she would consult with LSA Associate to change the language for a more general statement.

4.6.2 – Implementing Policies for Commercial and Industrial Land

- (e) A discussion held with Mr. Elssmann in the audience. He stated that in his opinion this item was too specific as to the location of commercial/industrial uses on California Street or Redlands Boulevard.

Commissioner Rosenbaum suggested that the language be changed to say, “encourage” that type of development in that area.

Ms. Lamson stated that she would consult with Mr. Zola and make any changes that he would suggest to clarify the language.

Element 6 – Transportation and Circulation

Glenn Elssmann spoke from his seat in the audience in regards to Figure 6.3 – Existing Bicycle Facilities Map and a discussion ensued regarding the use of the walking trails as bicycle paths.

Ms. Lamson stated that it could be verified.

Chair Neff suggested that the possible improvement to the pedestrian trail could be shown as a future bicycle trail on Figure 6.3.

- 6.4 – Parking

Commissioner Rosenbaum asked for clarification in the first paragraph, in the fifth line, the term “central”.

Ms. Lamson replied that the word could be removed.

- 6.5 – Truck Routes

Mr. Peterson explained that truck routes were designed as a pass through where any vehicle was allowed to access a construction site or make deliveries throughout the City.

Mr. Elssmann spoke from his seat in the audience and his question pertained to making California Street a truck route. Mr. Peterson replied that perhaps in the future it would be a consideration but with the current configuration, and the intersection at Redlands Boulevard, the City would prefer to wait until those issues were resolved and the widening of the road occurred.

Commissioner Rosenbaum suggested that a reference to a truck route on California Street be included.

Senior Planner Lamson stated that she would consult with Mr. Zola regarding the addition of California Street as a truck route.

- 6.6 Pedestrian Trails

Mr. Elssmann commented that it might be worth noting the creation of new trail linkages as new development occurs throughout the City in this section.

Senior Planner Lamson replied that she would consult with Mr. Zola on the language that could be added.

Mr. Bob Frost, Lawton Avenue, Loma Linda pointed out that in Section 9, on page 9-8 there was a policy for trails and coordination with public and private entities to link open spaces, etc.

- Figure 6.5 – Master Plan of Roadways

Commissioner Rosenbaum asked how the transition in road width on Redlands Boulevard from Anderson Street to Poplar Street would be accomplished. Mr. Peterson explained that it could be by the addition of a median, striping, or other devices.

Mr. Elssmann discussed Mission Road and the intent of keeping the road as a 2-lane street to maintain the rural feel of the area. Chair Neff replied that it was designated as a four-lane divided road on the Figure 6.5 he asked staff if there were ways to maintain it to a 2-lane divided road.

Mr. Peterson responded to say that the traffic volumes supported the 4 lanes whether it was divided or undivided. He continued to say that the Public Works Department had accepted the Mission Historic Overlay District and had chosen to go with a smaller street section with a more historic feel with the divided lines and streetscaping.

Ms. Lamson replied that she would consult with Mr. Zola, provide him with the intent of the discussion and ask him to clarify the issue of the width of Mission Road.

Mr. Dick Wiley addressed the Commission to ask how the City could address the fact that drivers use a business' parking lot as a shortcut when traffic was heavy. Mr. Peterson explained that the Public Works Department had identified a capital improvement project that would add landscaped medians in areas where the problem occurred while maintaining access to local businesses.

Mr. Elssmann expressed concerns in item (b) on page 6-13 as to where the language would apply because that it seemed like it was in conflict with the pedestrian traditional neighborhood design. Mr. Peterson replied that it applied more to arterial streets or collector streets.

Senior Planner Lamson stated that she would consult Mr. Zola on the issue to clarify which areas of the city would be affected.

- 6.10.2 – Non-motorized Transportation

- b) Commissioner Rosenbaum asked why the Community Development Department would determine the type of street lighting. Further to the discussion, Ms. Lamson agreed that the item could be revised to remove the reference to the Community Development Department, the word "street" at the beginning of the item and the word "vehicular" in the second paragraph.

Commissioner Patel had questions regarding Figure 6.6 that showed the Edison easement and the bicycle trail ending at San Timoteo Canyon and asked that the rest of the trail be extended to Beaumont Avenue on Figure 6.6. Ms. Lamson responded that there was a trail in the Edison easement but could not confirm that it was a bicycle trail. She added that she would contact Mr. Zola to clarify.

Element 7 – Noise Element

Commissioner Rosenbaum pointed out that there were two helipads at the Medical Center that were not referenced as part of Noise Sources.

Senior Planner Lamson agreed that it would be added to the text.

- Section 7.5 – Existing Noise Measurements

Commissioner Patel asked why the noise monitoring measurements were taken at non-peak hours. Specifically, Commissioner Patel was concerned that the measurements were taken when school was in session. Senior Planner Lamson replied that due to budget constraints, no changes could be made to the study at this late date.

- Section 7.6 – Identified Issues

Chair Neff pointed out that, in his opinion, trains were broad-based noise problems. Ms. Lamson responded that it was being compared to the noise levels near an airport. Chair Neff asked that the section identify train noise as significant.

Ms. Lamson suggested language be added as follows: "As compared to other communities of similar size" and make reference to trains in that paragraph and would consult Mr. Zola to add appropriate language.

- 7.8.1.1 – Implementing Noise Policies for Land Use and New Development

- a) Commissioner Rosenbaum asked for clarification on this item in regards to difference between "interior open space areas" and "indoor noise level". Ms. Lamson explained the difference and replied that she would ask Mr. Zola to add some clarification to the definitions under this item.

Mr. Elssmann requested that the reference to indoor noise levels at 55 dBA with "windows open" be removed, and that the noise levels for single-family residences within rear yards be increased to 65 dBA. Ms. Lamson agreed that it was difficult to measure the noise level with "windows open" and would recommend to Mr. Zola that the referenced be removed and that the noise level with rear yards be increased to 65dBA, as it was a standard level in a lot of cities.

Chair Neff requested that a general statement to address train noise issues be added to the section and Ms. Lamson stated that she would consult with Mr. Zola on the matter.

- i) Commissioner Rosenbaum suggested that this line items be combined with item j) as they contain the same directives. Ms. Lamson agreed.

- 7.8.1.2 – Implementing Noise Policies for Circulation and Transportation Noise

Commissioner Rosenbaum proposed the following changes:

- c) Eliminate the reference to the bi-county corridor as all other references in the Transportation and Circulation element have been removed.
- f) Change the reference to the Norton Air Force Base to its proper name of the San Bernardino Airport.

Element 9 – Conservation and Open Space

Mr. Elssmann commented that so much of the language in this element pertained to the South Hills and seemed to suggest that all of the Hills should be conserved as open space, along with key issues that were related to habitat designations and/or potential habitat designations and suggested that the discussion might be continued to the Workshop scheduled on April 19, 2004.

Senior Planner Lamson agreed with Mr. Elssmann but suggested that the overall discussion of the element be addressed at this time. She added that following the April 19, 2004 workshop any changes would be included in the final draft of the General Plan.

Chair Neff stated that Sections 9.2.1, 9.2.2, and 9.2.3 in the Natural and Visual Open Space Resources section should be left for discussion at the workshop.

Mr. Wiley suggested that provisions should be made to establish a large buffer zone between the open spaces and the homes in future developments as protection against fire emergencies. Ms. Lamson replied that because of the foothills and the potential of fire the area was considered a hazardous area and requirements for developers to provide mitigation for those events would be put into place.

- 9.2.9.1 – Implementing Policies for Visual Resources

Item b) Commissioner Rosenbaum pointed out that the item talks about slope density but did not specifically refer to the South Hills. Ms. Lamson stated that she would have the item corrected, as there are no other areas that would use a slope density calculation.

Item e) Commissioner Rosenbaum had the same comment for this section. Ms. Lamson stated that there were two schools of thought and that the issue would be discussed in detailed at the workshop on April 19, 2004.

Senior Planner Lamson reiterated to the Planning Commission that all sections related to the South Hills that had not been discussed at this meeting would be addressed in detail at the workshop on April 19, 2004 and the General Plan would be updated as necessary.

A discussion commenced regarding the preservation of citrus groves. Ms. Lamson replied that it was not a goal of the city to own and maintain a citrus grove, and that a grove would not be considered open space. She continued to say that using orange trees, as a symbol to preserve the citrus heritage was a good concept.

Commissioner Patel asked if Stan Timoteo Canyon should be considered open space. Senior Planner Lamson replied that sections of the canyon were being studied regarding the aviary species and creating a habitat would be considered as open space. She agreed that a reference should be noted in Figure 9.1.

Section 9.4 - Biological Resources

Chair Neff stated that this section would have a major affect on the South Hills, or on any developing property depending on its location.

Commissioner Rosenbaum commented that in Figure 9.3 on the riparian land and why it didn't continue the whole length of the waterway. Senior Planner Lamson replied that she would consult with Mr. Zola regarding the accuracy of the map. She continued to explain that it was most likely because that area had not been developed.

Mr. Elssmann informed the Planning Commission that they would request further review of some of the designations that LSA Associates pictured in the exhibits, in particular the designation for the gnatcatcher habitat. Chair Neff replied that before any development began, the applicant would have to perform a biological study of the area. Senior Planner Lamson explained to Mr. Elssmann that if there were modifications necessary, each project would be studied on its own merits. She added that LSA Associates had conducted its own study to arrive at the results published in the draft General Plan.

Chair Neff opened a discussion regarding the sensitivity of blue line streams from the USGS maps and asked if they had been included in the draft General Plan. Senior Planner Lamson replied that she would confirm with LSA Associates that blue line streams were identified and defined in the document.

- 9.4.4 Implementing Policies

- d) Commissioner Rosenbaum stated that she wished to discuss this item but would reserve her comments for the April 19, 2004 workshop, as this pertains to the South Hills.

Section 9.6 – Water Resources

Chair Neff asked that Associate Engineer Peterson comment on this item. Mr. Peterson replied that the General Plan covered the items that the Public Works Department was most concerned about. He added that the City of Loma Linda would require studies from future applicants to show that there was an adequate supply of water to serve the development. Currently, he said the City had an adequate production, but that future water demands and State water quality requirements may dictate some mitigation, such as a potential water treatment facility.

Element 1 – Introduction to General Plan Elements

A discussion occurred on the subject of public transit with comments regarding OmniTrans plans to establish a non-stop bus route from Cal State University to Loma Linda University.

Mr. Elssmann pointed out that there was no history of Mission Road. Senior Planner Lamson stated that she would consult with Mr. Zola to see if it was appropriate to include the Mission Road Historic Overlay District in the General Plan.

Mr. Elssmann pointed out a reference to the hillside issue to be added to the items to be discussed at the workshop on April 19, 2004.

Chair Neff commented that the review of Element 1 concluded the discussion for this evening.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

There were no minutes available for approval.

REPORTS BY THE PLANNING COMMISSIONERS

The Commissioners had no report to present.

COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT DIRECTOR REPORT

Staff had no reports to present.

ADJOURNMENT

Motion by Rosenbaum, seconded by Patel, and unanimously carried to adjourn the discussion of the draft General Plan to the regular meeting of April 7, 2004. (Christianson and Essex absent)

Motion by Rosenbaum, seconded by Neff, and unanimously carried to adjourn the meeting at 10:04 p.m.

Minutes were approved at the special meeting of July 7, 2004.

Administrative Secretary

I:\PlanningCom (PC)\PC 2004\04Mar31M-app.doc